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Stories are key ways to keep alive a people, a vision, a dream. We tell stories to help people know who we are; where we came from; and where we are going. There are individual stories and group stories. When a community tells its story, it is never singular; rather each storyteller relates the facts from her/his perspective. Each of the particular insights helps us to understand the whole.

Storytelling is what these essays you will be reading are all about. They tell the story of the Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary (IHM) of Monroe, Michigan, and the values we have tried to integrate into our sponsored educational institutions. We are telling the story primarily to you, the board members, administrators, faculty and staff of these institutions, so that you will get to know us better and join us in keeping our vision alive.

Over the last decade, the IHM Mission Integration Sponsorship Committee (MISC) has continually asked itself how we can make the IHM values come alive in our institutions now that there are fewer IHM Sisters. In the past, parents and students attending IHM schools could easily say, “it is an IHM school” and have a sense of what that meant. As times changed and fewer IHM Sisters were visibly present in these schools, we found ourselves needing to be clear about what makes this school an IHM school.

We formulated seven educational belief statements that seemed to capture this spirit; they follow this introduction. But statements that exist only on a page don’t come alive. They need a story to give them flesh, to make connections and to convey the energy necessary to keep living them into the future.

To try to bring these beliefs to life, the MISC invited some IHM Sisters to be part of a collaborative effort to write about key belief statements. We wanted the narrative to be historical and interpreted through each author’s unique lens. As a writing group, we reviewed each other’s essays multiple times, checking for historical accuracy and making sure the interpretation offered would resonate with the congregation.

We are pleased to offer these essays as a significant resource for you as you assume greater responsibility in living out the IHM vision in your institution. Although each essay is published separately, we hope you will find them interesting enough to read many, if not most, of them. Each essay tells its own story but all the essays tell a much fuller story of how IHM evolved and how it has and is affecting all of you in our sponsored schools.

We look forward to talking about the essays with you and would suggest planning time on various meeting agendas to reflect together on the story and how it impacts you and the future of your school. These essays are an inaugural step in our committee’s dream of having all current and future stakeholders in IHM institutions be so steeped in the IHM vision and so energized in living it out that the story of what makes an IHM school IHM continues well into the future.

Nancy Sylvester, IHM
Chair of the Mission Integration Sponsorship Committee
Core Educational Beliefs

Inspired by our founders, Theresa Maxis Duchemin and Louis Florent Gillet, the Congregation of the Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary (IHMs) have served the people of God in education since 1845.

The mission of the IHM-sponsored educational institutions includes personal and social transformation, which bear witness to the liberating mission of Jesus.

We believe our sponsored institutions are partners in mission by fostering excellence in education and by living into the following deeply held beliefs:

- a commitment to the **liberating mission of Jesus** with special focus on those who are poor, abandoned or oppressed;

- the **development of a Christian community** that witnesses to a profound respect for each human being and an acceptance of all persons;

- challenging students to make **decisions in the light of Gospel values** and global realities;

- encouraging students to **act on behalf of justice**;

- a commitment to eradicate the causes of oppression and injustice through a **feminist perspective** that empowers all;

- **ecological consciousness** that challenges all to recognize the interconnectedness and interdependence of all Creation and nurtures relationships that protect our common home; and

- a **holistic educational process** that fosters self-motivation, flexibility and openness to change.
Recently, a group of Immaculate Heart of Mary Sisters (IHMs) met to discuss sponsorship of our educational institutions. As the conversation deepened, we began to inquire into more foundational questions. We wondered aloud: “When considering the IHM congregation’s commitment to the work of education, with what have we been entrusted? What is the ‘treasure’ we have been given to hold in trust? What are we asking the trustees of our sponsored institutions to hold in trust?”

While there are no “correct” responses to these questions, reflection on them is important. Such reflection awakens awareness that an institution and its mission have particularity, characteristic qualities that mark its spirit. Those qualities emanate from the history of its founding and founders and from the beliefs, values, principles and priorities that held sway as decisions were being made and directions chosen. These qualities come together in a historically unique configuration and become identified over time as the institution’s tradition. This is certainly true when speaking of the IHM tradition of education.

This essay briefly examines IHM education from the congregation’s founding in 1845 until the early 1970s, a period of 125 years during which the congregation’s engagement in education was almost exclusively in schools, and formal education permeated every aspect of the community’s life and mission. A primary focus of this examination is on some of the historical roots of the most commonly and strongly experienced qualities that characterize the IHM congregation’s long and rich tradition in formal education. For it is from the unique historical moments, decisions and directions shaping the community’s growth and development that a tradition of educational excellence emerged. The qualities of educational excellence arose as well from the lives of thousands of IHM women who embodied and exemplified the character and values that became the hallmark of the IHM tradition.”
From the beginning, Fr. Louis Florent Gillet, CSsR, a Redemptorist priest from Belgium, and Mother Theresa Maxis Duchemin, a former Oblate Sister of Providence from Baltimore, co-founders of the IHM congregation, brought a missionary zeal to their efforts. Their desire was to provide education for girls and young women who had little or no education and were without instruction in their faith in the fledgling Monroe mission parish staffed by the Redemptorists.

On the morning of November 10, 1845, Fr. Gillet and the three original members of the IHM community (Theresa Maxis Duchemin, Charlotte Shaaff, also a former Oblate Sister, and Theresa Renauld) gathered in St. Mary Church for Mass and a simple ceremony that marked the beginning of the new religious institute. On Christmas day 1845, the first prospectus for a new school for young ladies was published in the *Monroe Advocate*, and on January 15, 1846, the Young Ladies’ Academy, as the school at Monroe was first called, opened with 40 pupils in the day school and four boarders. The young religious institute’s educational efforts took root, and the academy experienced slow but steady growth. By the end of the first decade, the enrollment stood at about 200 students attending the day school.\(^1\)

It was during these early years that the community witnessed the painful departures of Fr. Gillet (1847) and later the remaining Redemptorist priests from Monroe (1855). And, in one of the darkest hours of its history, the community endured Bishop Peter Paul Lefevere’s deposition of Mother Theresa Maxis as superior of the congregation and the forced separation of the IHM Sisters in Michigan from those in Susquehanna, Pa. (1859) where the community’s fourth mission school, St. Joseph, had been established in 1858. Of the 24 IHM Sisters at the time, 12 went to Pennsylvania and 12 remained in Michigan.
Bishop Lefevere’s appointment of a 32-year-old Belgian missionary, Fr. Edward Joos, as superior and director of the IHM congregation (1857) had been an unanticipated decision that “bore directly on Mother Theresa’s authority as superior in that it transferred practically all power belonging to her office, as provided in the rule, to the newly created office of superior-director for which the rule made no provision.”

Whatever Bishop Lefevere’s thoughts in making his appointment, this arbitrary act seemed to forecast the subsequent events of 1859 and, in retrospect, can be seen as the first act of unseating Theresa Maxis from her rightful role and place in the young community.

Fr. Joos served as director of the congregation for the next 43 years. Joos was ambitious, well-educated, committed to parochial education and a cousin to Fr. John DeNève, rector of the American College at Louvain, Belgium, a college Bishop Lefevere and Bishop Spalding of Kentucky had helped to establish hoping to produce more priests for America especially in the Midwest. In the paradoxical manner in which so much of life unfolds, the connection with DeNève would provide an important link to a theory and system of education that would influence the shape of IHM education for nearly a century.

In 1861, Sister Theresa Persyn wrote to Bishop LeFevere asking to be admitted into a group of sisters. Born in Thielt, Belgium, in 1817, Theresa joined the Sisters of Charity, where she remained for 25 years. With a deep desire to serve in the foreign missions and finding no community in Belgium with an international mission, she turned to the United States. Bishop LeFevere, a Belgian missionary himself, directed her to Fr. Joos in Monroe.

With the Civil War raging, Joos was not enthusiastic toward her request and considered the time not propitious for Persyn to come to America. Joos did tell his cousin, Fr. DeNève, about Sister Theresa and DeNève encouraged her to study the methods of teaching at the St. André Normal School at Bruges while she was waiting for needed approvals. Persyn agreed. On October 29, 1862, DeNève, writing to Joos relative to Sister Theresa Persyn's departure for America, noted:

She brings very valuable manuscripts for an academy. I hope the trouble I have taken will be useful to your convent in which I take a great interest.

The manuscripts Persyn brought with her represented the methodology of the Dames de St. André of Bruges, who had developed a plan and methodology based on the theories of bishop and educator Felix Antoine Dupanloup, for use in their teacher-training program for sisters in parochial schools.
In the 1948 centennial history of the Monroe IHMs, *No Greater Service*, Rosalita Kelly, IHM, made special note of these sources for the congregation’s system of education.

Catholic Belgium also provided the young institute of religious teachers with a theory of Christian education on which to form its own proper ideals. That theory was found in the St. André system of education. ... The plan actually was not entirely of Belgic origin. For much of its valuable content, the builders of the system relied on the plan of their great contemporary, the French educator, Bishop Félix Antoine Dupanloup of Orleans.⁶

It (Dames’ system of education) constituted the foundation and structure of the system of education developed by the Immaculate Heart congregation of Monroe. ... Its principles and methods were applied in every school of the institute, thus providing that reasonable uniformity so necessary in the early mission expansion.⁷

Into the 1920s, the IHMs modeled their own approach to education on the St. André system, adapting the system to the conditions that prevailed in mid-America and, more precisely, in Michigan.⁸ The sources and shaping influences of this period marked the IHM educational tradition with distinctive qualities in its philosophy, system and curriculum.
A Philosophy: Grounded in the Wholeness of Persons

JoEllen Vinyard (1998) in For Faith and Fortune, a history of the education of Catholic immigrants in Detroit from 1805 to 1925, notes that the IHMs were invited to staff one school after another in Detroit because of their position as a diocesan community, their ethnic diversity and their ties to well-placed families. It was, however, Vinyard argues, the development of a distinctive philosophy of education and a thoroughgoing system of education carefully followed that built their reputation.

Drawing on the educational theories of Félix Antoine Dupanloup, the educational plan the IHM community embraced and adapted beginning in 1862 was based on a four-pronged foundation: respect for the individual; formation of the whole person; religious formation; and the liberal arts.

Félix Antoine Philibert Dupanloup was born in 1802 and had himself benefitted from wonderful educational experiences. He was ordained a priest in 1825 and from his earliest days had become known for his fresh and successful approach to catechising. Soon, he also had established himself as an excellent public orator and director. From 1837-1845, Dupanloup served as the superior of the preparatory seminary of Saint-Nicolas. His transformation of that institution resulted in its becoming one in which members of the best families of France sought to send their children. As theorist and practitioner, he was in the forefront of the long battle for liberty in education in France.

Dupanloup was consecrated bishop of Orleans at age 47. During the next 28 years, he maintained an incredible pace in Church, civic and political affairs. He was recognized as one of the ablest French bishops of his day and a clerical spokesman for the liberal wing of French Catholicism, resisting the new conservatism of mid-19th century European Catholicism.

Dupanloup was also a prolific writer. His three-volume treatise on education, De l’éducation (1849), progressive in his own day, became a mainstay for French Catholic teachers.

For Dupanloup, at the center of all education was the child. Kelly notes:

Even a cursory examination of his work (Dupanloup) leaves no doubt that his concept of the child is the very heart of all his theorizing and of all his practical plans ... he reaches sublime heights on the child, made in the image and likeness of God, on Christian education, and the Christian educator whose purpose is to cooperate in bringing out that image more distinctly through the education and training of the heart, intellect, will, and body.
Education, Dupanloup insisted, is essentially a divine work with the principle relationship between God and the individual. Parents and teachers, in their own work with children, must always be mindful of this foundational relationship and give respect to the liberty of children’s nature, intelligence and will, and their need to follow their own vocation in life.\textsuperscript{14}

Dupanloup understood education as intellectual, moral, religious and physical, but essentially, he saw it as one, uniting all the dimensions, believing that to neglect any of its purposes would be fatal. He also viewed a solid grounding in all areas of study as foundational to more specialized training.

I do not ask that basic education cause the neglect of professional education. I wish, on the contrary, that it prepare for it remotely, that it assist it, that it enlighten it, fortify it, extend it, and elevate it; I wish that after having formed the honest man (sic), the man distinguished in mind and heart, that we endeavor to make of him, according to his vocation, a learned judge, an instructed and devoted doctor, a trained and fearless soldier, a skilled artist, a good worker.

I ask only that professional instruction should not sacrifice fundamental instruction. ... Doubtless education must study the aptitudes, and cultivate them with zeal; but it must never, in order to make a doctor, a lawyer, an engineer, a soldier, or a sailor, forget to form the man.\textsuperscript{15}

Dupanloup himself was likely influenced by Rousseau’s emphasis on the child’s freedom to participate in learning within a design whose end was already set by the teacher (1712-78) and Pestalozzi’s focus on character formation (1746-1827).\textsuperscript{16} These philosophies were also gaining importance among child-centered psychology advocates in America.

The principles central to the philosophy grounding the St. André method fit well within the IHM congregation, whose Constitutions, from the very beginning, set forth the spirit that should characterize the work of education to which it was dedicated. The educational philosophy and practice, which permeated the culture of the community during its foundational period, helped shape its spirit and approach to education even if the IHM Sisters were never consciously aware of its initial sources.

\begin{quote}
\textit{“Education, Dupanloup insisted, is essentially a divine work with the principle relationship between God and the individual.”}
\end{quote}
A System: Investment and Coherence

Investment in preparation for the work

For a community devoted exclusively to education, teacher training and subsequent formal certification were major undertakings. Successive general superiors of the community carried forward a solid tradition of providing more and better opportunities for the preparation of teachers by the congregation.

From the beginning, the community had been blessed with women with a background as teachers. Mother Theresa Maxis had come to Monroe with 12 years of teaching experience. Even in the early 1860s, when the community numbered only a dozen members, there were at least two experienced teachers who trained young sisters in methodology, drawing upon the tools and resources available at the time.\(^\text{17}\)

After the adoption of the St. André system in 1862, it would still be a few years before the system was used in more than the broadest terms. A small contingent of sisters was charged with making copies of the translated manuscripts so each school would have the guidelines available for review and renewal. In a pattern evident and continually repeated from the beginning of the congregation, community leaders selected women considered among the most outstanding teachers, had them learn the St. André methodology and then had them mentor other sister-teachers according to its directives.\(^\text{18}\)

In the United States, the normal school idea for preparing teachers made little headway until after 1870. So when the community opened its own normal school in Monroe in 1876, it matched quite favorably with approaches to teacher preparation being practiced in America at the time. Again, teachers from the academy and other sisters who had special training in a particular field were called upon to assist.\(^\text{19}\)
This steady commitment to preparing members for the work to which they were assigned served to position the community well as developments within the diocese pressed for certification of teachers. In 1886, the Seventh Diocesan Synod set forth the establishment of a diocesan board of schools, which had as one of its primary charges the examination and certification of teachers. For more than 30 years, teachers were certified and schools inspected by members of this diocesan board. The era of diocesan examinations came to a close in 1914, as university accreditation began to require degrees for high school teachers and pointed to changes that had long been anticipated by the IHM congregation.

In 1906, the community had begun to send some IHM postulants to the University of Michigan to earn their bachelor’s degrees before entering the novitiate. This policy, without precedent in Catholic higher education, was viewed as a necessity given the fact that until 1905, and for some years thereafter, no Catholic college in the United States made provisions for the higher education of religious women. Between 1906 and 1932, the community provided for the education of 20 postulants through this unique arrangement.

The need for graduate degrees became apparent when the community established St. Mary College in Monroe in 1910 and only intensified as educational requirements for teachers at the college and high school levels continued to increase. In 1911, the community began sending some professed sisters to Catholic University in Washington, D.C., for graduate studies. In 1916, two sisters received their master’s degrees from the University of Michigan and by the end of the 1920s, at least 16 IHMs had a master’s degree, many of them from the University of Notre Dame. One had a doctorate from Catholic University and two had doctorates from Fordham.

In 1925, when the Dacey Law took effect in Michigan requiring all teachers to have a minimum of two years of college to be state-certified, the IHM community’s continual efforts of teacher preparation were evident: all IHM grade and high school teachers held state certification before the required deadline.
For the majority of IHMs, their studies and preparation for teaching began at the Motherhouse in Monroe when they were postulants and, after being assigned to a parish school, continued through many summers. Up until 1950, most sisters were able to study full-time in Monroe only through the first two years and then spent the next 10 to 20 years finishing their bachelor’s degrees during summer vacations in Monroe.

Uncommon among most religious congregations, the IHM community, from its earliest days, had a practice in which virtually the entire congregation returned each summer to their Motherhouse. The time provided an opportunity for retreat and vacation. During this time, experienced and competent teachers of the community also held classes for groups of younger sisters. The classes became an identifiable feature of IHM summers and soon became the organized summer school that would persist well into the 1950s. A chronicle entry from 1943 indicates the scope of the endeavor:

On Wednesday, June 23, the 1943 Summer School opened with an enrollment of nearly 1000, to close on August 3. With the exception of two Sisters studying in Ann Arbor [University of Michigan], four in Washington [D.C., Catholic University], two in New York [Fordham University], and about fifty at Marygrove [Detroit], all were in class on the home campus.

A major change in the preparation of IHMs was ushered in with the congregational elections of 1948. Sister Mary Patrick Riley, elected to serve as a member of the congregation’s general council, was charged with overseeing the education of the sisters. One of her primary goals was to make certain each young sister within the congregation had the opportunity to acquire a bachelor’s degree before beginning her teaching career. To that end, and assisted by Sister Mary Emil Penet, Riley established the “Juniorate” in Monroe in January 1949. Together with campus college staff, they developed a curriculum designed to integrate the spiritual, intellectual and professional preparation of young sisters in formation. Their objective was threefold: to give sisters an intellectual structure for their spiritual lives; to foster their appreciation of culture and of the intellectual life generally; and to develop their professional competence as teachers, in terms of both technique and content. By the early 1950s, the Monroe campus of Marygrove College offered a full four-year bachelor’s degree program that served the community for nearly 20 years.

With a rapidly expanding parochial school system, the Detroit diocese was in the midst of an acute teacher shortage. The decision to have sisters complete their degrees before beginning to teach was therefore a courageous one, and one that encountered strong pushback from diocesan personnel.
At the same time, Riley also charged Sister Xaveria Barton to research and reorganize all the sisters’ educational files. This was done so assignments for summer schools and for study programs at other universities and colleges could be made more effectively, thus facilitating the completion of degrees for those sisters who had begun their studies prior to the inauguration of the Juniorate program.²⁵ Penet’s vision and leadership skills, along with Riley’s administrative expertise and leadership position within the congregation, combined with their unusual aptitude for risk-taking, shaped forever the education of the Monroe IHMs.

Both women also contributed significantly to the professionalization of sisters beyond the IHM congregation. Each offered leadership to a national movement among religious congregations, “Sister Formation,” that crystallized in 1954 with the founding of the Sister Formation Conference.²⁶ Josephine Sferrella, IHM, in writing of the Monroe IHM involvement in the Sister Formation Movement, notes:

The IHM congregation participated in the movement. However, it was more than participation: In many respects, Sister Formation was the Monroe plan. Events that occurred at the national level either were preceded by a similar action in Monroe or were impacted by the involvement of those working in the IHM formation program at this time.²⁷

Riley continued to press for the professional preparation of sister-teachers, taking her message to the first National Congress of U.S. Religious convened at the behest of Pope Pius XII and held at the University of Notre Dame in 1952. There, she urged a greater reliance on lay teachers in parochial schools, so that sisters could be afforded a lengthened period of religious and professional preparation. Penet was among the founders of the Sister Formation Conference and served as its executive secretary from 1954 until 1960.²⁸

“Penet’s vision and leadership skills, along with Riley’s administrative expertise and leadership position within the congregation, combined with their unusual aptitude for risk-taking, shaped forever the education of the Monroe IHMs.”

The Monroe campus served as the formation college for the IHM congregation and also provided an education to members of other religious congregations from Peru, Kenya and Thailand as well as sisters from other congregations throughout the United States. Because of declining numbers, the Monroe college campus was closed in 1969 and formation houses of study were opened in Chicago, Washington, D.C., St. Louis and Detroit, to enable sisters to study at campuses in those cities.²⁹
Coherence in Focusing the Work of Education

Once the sisters were away from Monroe and “on mission,” the life patterns of the local school and convent also aided in supporting and focusing the work of teaching. Peer support emerged informally among sisters living and working together and often became friendships and mentoring relationships that lasted well beyond the time shared at the same school. The house schedule of local school-based convents provided for definite times for class preparation. Additional time was given those with heavy schedules or those teaching an extra load. From 1863 until 1967, the superiors and principals of local convents and schools had a “superiors guide” (with a variety of titles over the years) to assist them with their administrative and supervisory duties. Frequently, materials in the guide focused on ongoing teacher preparation and suggested topics for well-planned faculty meetings. Summer meetings between the congregational superior and IHM school principals included discussions of items in the superiors guide. Beginning in 1919, the congregation appointed sisters to serve as school supervisors with the purpose of helping young teachers.

Over the years, the congregation also established educational councils and education committees, a principals’ association and boards of education. As Sferrella notes, these groups scheduled regular meetings, held educational institutes for all the sisters and gathered focus groups to tap into the energies of the sisters and mobilize further reforms and changes to the congregation’s educational mission. Vinyard describes it well. “By their total absorption in the work of teaching, they formed their character as a collective corps of professionals.”
Kelly surmises that, all things considered, it is quite probable that one or two of the “advanced” subjects listed in the prospectus were taught from the beginning with additions made to the curriculum as the school became more established. She notes, however, that the listing of instrumental music was a brave gesture, as the piano was little known in pioneer homes, parlor organs were only beginning to make their appearance and the fiddle, while an essential of French merry-making, was not an instrument for which anyone took lessons. Additionally, the school possessed not one of these instruments, with only a primitive organ to be found in the choir loft in the church across the street!34

With the introduction of the St. André system into the community schools soon after 1862, the subjects required were formal English grammar and composition, spelling, penmanship, reading, mental and written arithmetic, geography, bookkeeping, linear
design and history. To these, seven high school subjects were added in about 1865: algebra, rhetoric, elements of natural philosophy, chemistry, astronomy, botany and zoology. French and German, as well as music and art, were offered but not required.  

Over the next 70-plus years, the community continued to refine and update its own course of study for all its schools. The process of curriculum-making for the IHM-staffed schools was a cooperative effort involving some of the best teachers in the community. Large-scale curriculum revisions for the grade schools occurred in 1890, 1910 and 1930. The general superior appointed committees of sisters who worked several summers preceding the years of completion to formulate and then publish the revised curriculum. Kelly observes that one index of the expansion in ideas and experience was reflected in the size of the printed volumes. “The curriculum of 1872 was some half dozen pages; that of 1890, nineteen pages in length, grew to a volume of more than one hundred pages in the 1910 edition; the 1930 edition numbered approximately two hundred fifty pages.”  

With each revision came modifications based on the times and new educational research, as well as a reaffirmation of the IHM educational philosophy and methodology based on the St. André method.  

Textbooks used in IHM-staffed elementary schools were also deliberately chosen, even differing at times from those nationally popular among Catholic schools. Having been carefully chosen, the books would then be used year after year so families could save money by having their children pass them on to younger siblings.  

Fidelity to following the course of studies was not a matter of personal feeling, for, as Kelly notes, “the constitutions expressly required adherence ‘to the prescribed regulations and course of study arranged for the schools of the Congregation.’”  

Catholic secondary education in Detroit followed a trajectory that was first evident within public education. Detroit’s first tax-supported high school, Central High School, opened in 1858, but it was not until 1876 that all four secondary grades were consolidated into a single unit. By the early 1880s, Irish parishes and the IHM Sisters who staffed their schools were beginning to add a secondary program for girls to their grade schools, one year at a time. Most Holy Trinity School graduated its first students from an abbreviated program in 1881 and St. Vincent School soon had all four years in place. As Vinyard notes: “These two schools became the prototype for the others and established the local image of parochial secondary education at its best – small with classes almost like tutorials, tailored to fit individual needs, and charging low tuition.”  

Gradually, IHM-staffed high schools became coeducational, in part to dissuade the boys from going to public high schools. By 1915 when IHM Sisters staffed eight of the nine parish high schools in Detroit, all but two admitted boys, though the preponderance of the students at the time were girls.
The course of study in IHM-staffed high schools was modeled on the one followed at St. Mary Academy in Monroe, which served as the congregation’s “curriculum lab.” As Leslie Tentler (1990) notes, the Academy had quickly moved its curricular orientation to an emphasis on academic standards.

For much of the nineteenth century, the IHMs presented St. Mary Academy to the public as an oasis of piety and gentility. ... But the educational aspirations and achievements of the IHMs, unusually high from the order’s beginning, meant St. Mary’s was in fact more rigorous and academic in its curriculum than the typical young ladies’ academy of the period. By the 1890s, the school had largely shed its genteel image, boasting now of its strict academic standards and thorough instruction in the sciences.39

The congregation also recognized the importance of affiliating the Academy with institutions of higher learning. As early as 1891, the Academy passed inspection by the Superintendent of Public Instruction in Michigan and was accredited by the University of Michigan in 1899. By the turn of the century, the Academy was affiliated with the Michigan State Normal School and the Catholic University of America. It was placed on the North Central list in 1925.40

As in all aspects of its teaching ministry, the congregation built upon the St. André system in fashioning its approach to education and drew upon existing ideas in shaping the design of its course of study. The comprehensiveness of the IHM plan, as Vinyard observes, “shaped IHM schools in different ways than either the public schools or those parochial schools staffed by other religious communities,” and gained for the congregation both acceptance and its reputation of excellence “because it served so many separate interests successfully. The plan was an amalgam. Dupanloup provided the theory. The St. André teacher-training system provided principles of education, pedagogy, methodology and school administration.”41

In the early 1930s, the Detroit diocese, under the direction of Monsignor Carroll Deady, superintendent of schools from 1934-1957, began instituting changes within all diocesan schools. Deady had strong credentials as a pedagogue and a passion for what he saw as needed school reform across the schools of the diocese. In his efforts, he sought a uniform curriculum, a uniform approach to pedagogy and more stringent regulation of teacher education.42

For the IHMs at the time, for whom such coherence in educational approach was what characterized their philosophy and system of education since the 1860s, many of the reforms were viewed as undermining some foundational tenets of the St. André system. Of particular concern was the “rotation” of elementary students among several teachers, which was viewed as altering the relationship between the teacher and student and her intuitive understanding of the children in her care. So too was the IHMs’ concern with the rigidities of the unit system which they saw as hampering the full pedagogical expertise of the experienced teacher.43
Within the context of the diocesan reform movement underway as Kelly completed her centennial history of the IHM congregation, the final paragraph in her chapter on the IHM course of study takes on deeper meaning.

Curriculum making and curriculum planning by the congregation for its own schools came to an end when the archdiocese of Detroit prescribed a course of study to be followed by all parochial grade and high schools. The Sisters of the community have, however, contributed to the cooperative effort which has made possible this uniform course.

**The Marygrove Idea**

The community’s commitment to the liberal arts found full expression with the establishment of Marygrove College. Signs of the college’s beginnings appeared as early as 1899 but it was not until 1905 that a junior college course of study was inaugurated at St. Mary in Monroe. Two years later, the first full and distinct collegiate department was established. In 1910, St. Mary College was empowered by charter to grant degrees and became the first Catholic college for women in the Diocese of Detroit. Anticipating the need for building expansion, the community had plans for building a new college in Monroe. However, in 1922, responding to a request from Bishop Gallagher that the college be build in Detroit, the community purchased an 80-acre wooded plot in Greenlawn Township. Gallagher felt that the college would serve as a monument to Detroit, have a larger field of influence in the city and would offer an opportunity to thousands of young women who would otherwise not have a chance to acquire a Catholic higher education. The college continued in Monroe until 1927, but two years prior to its move to Detroit, the name was changed to Marygrove College, “recalling the heavily wooded acres out of which the white stone walls would rise to tall metal-capped towers under the auspices of Mary.”
With the move to Detroit, Mother Domitilla Donohue appointed Dr. George Hermann Derry as the first president of the new college (1927-1937), recognizing in his own philosophy of education a match with the congregation’s educational vision. Earlier in his life, Dr. Derry had been a member of the Jesuit community for 12 years, had come to know intimately its own system of education, the Ratio Studiorum, and was convinced of its efficacy. He believed this system of education could be adapted for the college education of women and proceeded to implement his vision during his tenure as president. He called his adaptation the “Marygrove Idea.”

For Derry, the “Marygrove Idea” addressed those capacities of a well-educated person that constituted the seven liberal arts. These, in turn, shaped the college curriculum into four main divisions: foundational, philosophical, religious and vocational.

The foundational work, covering the first two years, had for its purpose “the mastery of the tools of expression,” the philosophical, including junior and senior year, “the scientific mastery of thought itself and of the materials of expression.” The religious phase of the curriculum, embracing four years of study, sought to achieve the formation of Christian character, “fostered by the efficacious and unremitting reference of religion to life.” The fourth, or vocational, phase, confined chiefly to the last two years, purposed to provide each student with such specialized courses in the field of her choice as would fit her for work after graduation.47

In 1937, Sister Honora Jack, IHM, succeeded Derry as president of the college (1937-1961). Prior to her appointment as president, Jack had served the college as head of the English department and, since 1930, had been the dean of the college and so was very familiar with the “Marygrove Idea.” She, like Derry, drew much of her own educational philosophy from Aquinas’ writings on a Catholic philosophy of education and a liberally educated person.
While the essentials of the system of education at Marygrove did not change under Jack, “there was a definite widening and deepening both in curricular and co-curricular aspects.” Evident in her philosophy and in her approach to the college curriculum was her own IHM formation and education. Kelly, quoting from the 1939 college catalog, notes where Jack places her emphasis in her own “educational creed.”

A college that accepts a student, assumes a four-year responsibility, more or less complete, for the whole student. The attitude of a given college toward that responsibility and the provision it makes for fullness of life on the part of the student are necessarily conditioned by the ideals and purposes of the institution.

With this basic premise, Marygrove moved forward “on the assumption that the student learns to live by living.” The liberal arts curriculum was now organized along seven major interests, each meeting the problems of some phase of living: the art of communication, natural science, science of social relations, philosophy, religion, Catholic Action and vocational techniques in all the major fields of business and the professions open to women.

A distinctive addition to the curriculum during this time was the system of “planned integration,” which came about in 1938. Jack envisioned a series of interdisciplinary experiences stranded throughout the four years, enabling each student to achieve “the integrated personality” associated with a liberal arts education. Students participated in a freshman orientation, sophomore open forum and junior-senior seminars. Each class required students to thoroughly research and write a paper, then present and discuss it and finally, defend it in the company of students and faculty from several disciplines.

Student involvement in community service was also an important educational value for Jack. She established a staff position of director of social action, which was charged with providing direction, counseling and supervision of students in volunteer activities, ranging from hospitals to schools to social service agencies. By the early 1950s, two-thirds of Marygrove students were involved in volunteer service and the college’s program received several national awards.

The presidency (1961-1968) of Sister Mary Emil Penet, IHM, brought national attention to Marygrove, not the least because of her own adamant belief in the education of women and her commitment to social reform and educational justice. In 1963, with Marygrove’s early membership in the Fitzgerald Community Council, a neighborhood organization committed to integrating the northwest Detroit area, Penet responded in a press conference: “The acid test of our sincerity in banding together in this Community Council is whether in our heart of hearts we ever would want a lily-white neighborhood here if we could have it. Marygrove would not want it.”
In many ways, the IHM community’s vision for education, and its belief in the liberating power of education in the lives of people, emerged from within the experiences of its members and in response to needs evident during the first century of its existence. Education became a means of strengthening faith, instructing immigrant communities attempting to make a home in a new country and modeling and addressing the importance of education for women.

**Strengthening Faith**

A concern for “saving the faith” in the rural areas of the country was a problem that confronted every early missionary who came in service to America and haunted every pioneer bishop. The Redemptorists came to know this problem in southeast Michigan as they travelled from mission to mission. Fr. Gillet, for his part, was clear from the beginning that his intention was the preserving of faith through the education of women who, as the mothers, would be able to instill and nurture faith in their children.

Sister Jane Mary Howard, IHM, (1968) served as interim president immediately after the urban rebellion in Detroit. Recognizing Marygrove’s own insularity, she initiated what has become commonly referred to as “68 for ’68” – a recruitment program designed to attract additional black young women for the fall 1968 term. It included offering one scholarship to a senior from every public high school in Detroit. The Marygrove College Talent Program was also started to provide pre-college training to black young women who, though deprived of some regular college preparatory courses, were otherwise ready for college.53

In writing about the history of Marygrove, Vinyard notes: “key to Marygrove’s history is the core idea which underlies its educational philosophy from at least the beginning of the Detroit campus in 1927. From that time Marygrove had one basic tradition: a dedication to the idea that it is possible through mobilizing knowledge and ability within a framework of Christian values, to arrive at a more just, humane society.”54
Because of the vastness of territory for which the Redemptorists were responsible, they devised a plan for providing religious instruction to girls living at a distance from Monroe. The sisters embraced the idea as they too gave priority to religious education from the beginning.

The convent ... opened its doors to girls from the outlying districts who came as boarders for a period of three months. During their stay, they received daily catechetical instruction from the priests and Sisters in preparation for the sacraments. Brief though this instruction period was, it gave the recipients something to cling to. They were expected to return to their homes and to help others by teaching what they had learned and by setting good example. The first group, numbering ‘fourteen Irish and two Canadians,’ arrived at the convent on July 27, 1848.55

The IHM community found affinity with the St. André system in its approach and emphasis regarding religious education. Following Dupanloup’s theories closely, the system gave increased importance to the qualities of the religious teacher herself and the relationship between the teacher and her students. Accordingly, a teacher should give evidence of “goodness, evenness of mind and temper ... in one word, that religious maturity which commands respect and confidence.”56 With regard to the authority of the teacher, as the system expressed it, the keynote was “reciprocal respect between teacher and pupil, the teacher’s devotedness, her evident happiness in associating with her pupils, her willingness to praise where praise was merited, and her evenhanded justice.”57 Practice of virtue and piety was essentially understood as character education, a cultivation, exercise, and development of all of one’s faculties – physical, intellectual, moral and religious – in order to form a person of reason, heart, firm faith and character, a person for their century and their country.58 Respect for the dignity and liberty of a child’s nature was paramount. Persuasion, not force, was to accompany a teacher’s effort with students and their self-improvement, “which in the last analysis must be their own personal undertaking seconded by the grace of God.”59

There is no doubt that religious education, understood to include the whole of the child, took precedence in both Dupanloup’s theories of education and the St. André system. Kelly notes:

It (religious education) included far more than the teaching of religion courses, though these were planned, in content and method of teaching, in detail not found in any other subject in the Bruges system; and this characteristic was preserved intact in the adaptation of the system made by the congregation of the Immaculate Heart. The whole atmosphere of the school was permeated with religion; the child was taught not to get ready to live a spiritual life but actually to live it then and there.60
Religious education was a priority for the congregation. As it began to staff parochial schools in the diocese and beyond, the IHMs also reached out to students not attending Catholic schools by teaching religious education classes (CCD classes) for public school students, not only in the parishes in which they were stationed, but also beyond the parish boundaries.

Teaching Children of Immigrants

The immigrant experience in the United States during the mid to late 19th century had a profound effect on women religious in this country, as the needs of immigrant communities helped to define the work of the many religious orders of sisters. This was certainly the case in the Diocese of Detroit and with the Monroe IHM congregation.

The Diocese of Detroit was established in 1833 and was coextensive with the Michigan Territory, which at that time encompassed what is now Michigan and Wisconsin as well as a portion of Minnesota. Within the first 10 years of the diocese’s existence, new dioceses were carved out of this territory so that by 1843, the Diocese of Detroit included only what is now Michigan.

In the early 1830s, in the Michigan portion of the diocese, Catholics numbered approximately 15,000, with a majority being French-speaking. The immigrant population of Detroit began multiplying around 1830. By 1835, the city’s population was able to support a second Catholic parish, Most Holy Trinity, whose rolls in 1840 contained the names of 202 heads of families, nearly all of them of Irish birth or descent. After 1847, Irish immigrants, fleeing the potato crop failure, came in large numbers. Even larger numbers of Germans, about one-third of whom were Catholics, followed shortly thereafter. The Irish immigrants gravitated toward Most Holy Trinity, while Detroit’s German families, even more than the Irish, tended to settle near each other. Detroit’s population continued to increase, from 21,000 in 1850 to 80,000 in 1870, due in large part to immigration.
The place of birth and the parentage of women entering the IHM community between 1860 and 1870 reflected the waves of immigration to the United States between 1830 and 1850. Thirty-eight of the 80 women who entered the community during this decade were born outside the United States and of the 42 American-born entrants, both parents of 19 were born in Ireland; the parents of the others came mostly from Canada and continental Europe; very few from the United States.63

In 1861, as the community opened its first school in Detroit, the Catholic population in the city was primarily French, German and Irish. Given the ethnic diversity of the community and with several IHMs bilingual in French and English or German and English, the community was well-positioned to teach the children of Catholic immigrants. Community leaders took these factors into consideration as they made assignments to parish schools, often matching sisters both as teachers and as principal to serve the ethnic needs of the parish. The community’s monopoly on Irish education in Detroit began with their teaching of Irish sons at Most Holy Trinity in 1867, and the teaching of their daughters following shortly thereafter. From this base, IHMs were invited to staff each parish school the Irish opened.

Starting in the 1860s and until the 1880s, the IHM Sisters taught nearly eight in 10 Detroit parochial school students. Vinyard observes: “to the extent that there was any ‘system’ of Catholic education (in Detroit), the IHMs provided it as the common denominator among several immigrant parishes. The content, philosophy, and instructional style that came to characterize local Catholic education in the formative Irish and German era related significantly to the development of this congregation of women.”64

As the IHMs accompanied parish families in their moves to new, more affluent schools, they also remained in the schools left behind by the second and third generations of immigrant families. The philosophy and curricular focus of the community, “the uniformity in content, purpose, and style meant that thousands of children received an education in common, regardless of their economic class or nationality.”65
Promoting Women Through Education

When the 1969 IHM General Chapter passed an enactment on the education of women, it was affirming a value that has been a dominant theme throughout the history of the IHM congregation.

In our educational apostolate we should manifest to the world the dignity of womanhood and in accordance with the directives of Vatican II transmit this understanding to others.

Fr. Gillet was clear that a central reason for founding a new religious community of women was for the education of girls. Mother Theresa Maxis, an educated and strong woman in her own right, worked to offer the finest education “for young ladies” in the Monroe area. The Dames de St. André of Bruges, devoted exclusively to the education of girls, placed emphasis on the proper education of women in their adaptation of Dupanloup’s theories of education, believing that as “mother in the home she would be a child’s first teacher ... [and] the further fact that woman’s influence reached far beyond the home and affected society for good or ill, was an added reason for giving her a well-rounded education based on Christian principles.”

Vinyard, in her reflection on the IHMs’ approach to women’s education, concludes:

Unlike the education of Rousseau planned for Sophie in Emile or Dupanloup envisioned for females, the nuns knew there was an alternative to life as wife and mother – theirs – and that in America, a woman, especially if she was a poor Catholic immigrant, might have to do more than tend to her home and family. Toward the end of educating females as they saw them, the IHM sisters soon were going off on their own, beyond Dupanloup’s charge. In practice, the curriculum they designed had much in common with nineteenth-century feminist thought.

As a community of women, IHMs were committed to their own education, seeing that educated women religious offered legitimacy and an example for the education of girls and of women. They could serve as role models for young girls who could themselves be well-educated and leaders.

The principal commitment of the community by way of congregational ownership and staffing of schools was the education of women. Throughout its history, the community owned and staffed four women’s high schools – St. Mary Academy (Monroe), Immaculata (Detroit), Immaculate Heart of Mary (Westchester, Ill.), and Marian High School (Bloomfield Hills, Mich.) – and Marygrove College. These represented an immense investment of the congregation’s meager material resources and a tremendous commitment of personnel.
Barbara Johns, IHM, in an essay on Immaculata High School, spoke to a dynamic that might be said of each of the IHM institutions committed to the education of women:

Immaculata in the late 1970s and early 1980s was, at its heart, what it had been from the very beginning: a mirror image of the IHM sisters’ complex and evolving corporate identity, a reflection of the IHMs attempt to define – for themselves and for their students – “women’s place” and the role of women’s institutions within changing ecclesiastical and social realities. ... (Immaculata) is a story of how IHM women and the “spiritual daughters” who were their students sought together – often in ambiguous, difficult, and contradictory ways – to understand what it meant to be religiously-grounded, well-educated, and socially conscious women in the world.69
With the staffing of its first school in Detroit (1861), the community began a gradual expansion of its educational reach. Over the next several decades until the early 1940s, the community staffed 72 schools, including five in Ohio and one in Illinois. In 1948, Mother Teresa McGivney, the community’s general superior at the time, accepted a request from Bishop Davis of San Juan, Puerto Rico, to send sisters to assist with a school in Cayey, Puerto Rico – the first of five educational institutions that IHM Sisters helped to staff from 1948 to 1973. By 1961, IHMs staffed 96 schools in 16 dioceses (including the Archdiocese of Detroit and four other Michigan dioceses). That same year, 147 sisters staffed schools in eight states beyond Michigan; in Alabama, California, Florida, Illinois, Minnesota, Missouri, New Mexico and Ohio.

The community’s engagement in education, which from its beginning had found expression almost exclusively in formal schooling, began to shift during the mid-1960s and early 1970s. Two significant events that occurred during this time are often cited as pivotal in that movement.

The Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) was a watershed moment in the life of the Church, as was the call for renewal of religious life that emanated from the Council. As a community, IHMs welcomed the vision of the Council as the work of the Spirit for the renewal of the Church. The tradition of returning to the Motherhouse during the summer had enabled the community to stay aware of the changing theological currents of the times and helped prepare and position the community for changes emerging from the Council. Beginning in the early 1900s and continuing beyond Vatican II, national and international experts had addressed the community on a host of areas including scripture, sacraments, Christology, morality, liturgy, and ecumenism. In the late 1960s, Margaret Brennan, then president of the congregation, made the decision to educate one IHM Sister for every 100 members of the community to the doctoral level of theology. Ten sisters were sent to schools of theology in the United States and abroad in Belgium, France and Rome to earn their doctorates and licentiates in various areas of theology and scripture.
The community’s post-Vatican Council assessment and response led many sisters to realize their gifts and skills might be more effective in meeting some of the other crying needs of our world and Church. And indeed, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, other monumental changes were taking place throughout society. The struggle for racial justice and the women’s movement were major developments during these decades and they too impacted the IHM Sisters. But, for a congregation that had been school-focused for well more than a century, the shift into new ministries did not occur without pain and struggle for its members.

The shift was accelerated with the passage of the 1970 ballot Proposal C in Michigan. The ballot proposal was an amendment to the Michigan Constitution to prohibit state aid to nonpublic schools and students. For many pastors, the passage of the proposal and the constitutional prohibition on state aid was viewed as the death knell for their parish schools. Many of the parish schools IHMs had staffed for years began closing in the wake of Proposal C. Again, the community’s tradition of academic and professional preparation, as well as theological education, made it possible for IHMs to move into new ministries.

Today, IHMs continue to work within formal educational institutions, as well as in parish ministry, advocacy for justice, spiritual direction and retreat ministries, pastoral support and efforts on behalf of sustainable life systems. Wherever they minister, IHMs are educators whether formally or informally. Amata Miller, IHM, in a 1998 presentation to the community on themes found within the IHM identity, noted: “In whatever we do we are educating, in the broad sense of that word, aiming to enable people to fulfill their potential, assisting in their liberation and empowerment.”

“The struggle for racial justice and the women’s movement were major developments during these decades and they too impacted the IHM Sisters.”
Whether as members of the IHM community, as trustees of a sponsored IHM institution or as partners in mission and ministry, we have each been touched in some way and gifted by the IHM tradition of education. So the questions that linger are important ones for us. With what have we been entrusted? What is the “treasure” we have been given to hold in trust?

While each critical reading and reflection on the history of the IHM tradition of education offers an opening for new insights into these questions, some characteristic qualities seem to emerge as central to the IHM tradition.

Respect for the dignity of the individual and one’s unique nature, gifts and life journey is a quality that was embodied in the founders’ lives, taught as a central tenet in the St. André method and expressed in community documents to be reflected upon and practiced by each member in her work with students. Education is to be directed toward the formation of the whole person. The community’s commitment to the liberal arts and to an experience of an integrated and integrating education was grounded in a belief that education is intellectual, spiritual and physical; but essentially it is one. As formative of the whole person, education should contribute to students integrating an intellectual life, faith life and life of service to their families, professions and the civic and global community; moving them to work on behalf of a more just, humane society.

As a congregation, we have been especially attentive to our own education, for ministry and for ongoing personal development. The IHM tradition of education is marked by an investment in preparing people for the work to which they have been called and in providing the support and mentoring that focus and strengthen their efforts. We are respectful of learning and the importance of education in the empowerment of people, especially women and those who have not been afforded access to quality education.
Respect for learning has also included an expectation that decision-making is rooted in careful research and planning, with serious study given to options and their applications. Throughout our history, the community has been blessed with people whose vision anticipated new needs and larger horizons, who urged the community forward, who prepared for a future not yet able to be seen. Processes of envisioning future directions, of decision-making, planning and implementation have not been without struggle, but such efforts have also provided the communal space for ongoing transformation and growth for individuals and the community as a whole. If, as Michael Himes notes, “the best education is the company of best companions,” then, as IHMs, we have had and continue to have the best education. Such experiences have confirmed our own belief in the power of communities learning together and have shaped our educational practices within our various ministries.

But, no matter the richness of a tradition, entrusting another with that tradition is never static. Human needs and societal issues change and call us to a faithful attention to new situations and contexts, current and future challenges. Each significant challenge and each critical decision point will require a renewed interpretation of the values and vision expressed in the IHM tradition of education balanced with the needs for the common good inherent in the present situation.

Being entrusted with a tradition also invites the continual practice of asking what the mission and vision call the organization to be and do within the larger whole of which it is a part. This dynamic requires more than organizational and strategic planning. It calls for sustained inquiry and an interpretive engagement with the deep needs of the world that become visible when viewed through the lens of the institution’s tradition.

This brief essay is a historical retrieval, an examination and inquiry into the IHM tradition of education and educational excellence. The essay is framed by the present need to entrust the great treasure of this tradition into the hands and hearts of a new generation of leadership facing new and complex challenges. The deep hope is that those who have been recipients of the transforming power of education – and particularly those who have been entrusted with the “treasure” at the heart of the IHM tradition of education – will respond to the biblical imperative: “The gift you have received, give as a gift.”
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